



CWP-3427-2025

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

333-3.

CWP-3427-2025

Date of Decision:11.03.2026

SATYAPAL @ SATPAL

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA

Present: Mr. Pankaj Yadav, Advocate and
Mr. Ajit Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anant Kataria, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 4-HSVP.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J.(ORAL)

1. Petitioner has assailed allotment letter, whereby a plot allotted to him, has been cancelled on account of non-deposit of earnest money under the oustees quota. A direction has been sought to restore the plot in question and to charge the price as applicable in financial year 2010-11.

2. At the outset, counsel concedes that issue has been finally determined by this Court vide judgment passed in **Ombir and others Vs.**

State of Haryana and others (CWP-22302-2024 decided on 25.02.2026),



CWP-3427-2025

-2-

whereby a bunch of writ petitions was dismissed by a Division Bench with following observations:-

*“27. On the other hand, we also cannot lose sight of the fact that, despite issuance of the allotment letters, the petitioners failed to comply with the terms and conditions thereof, and the delay on their part has ultimately proved fatal to their claim. Consequently, the benefit of the judgment in **Ram Lal Mahendru Vs. State of Haryana and others, Law Finder Doc Id #2826057** with regard to price and the extended period for payment cannot be extended at this stage, particularly when the allotment letters already stand cancelled. Nevertheless, the petitioners still retain the opportunity to revive their entitlement as oustees in accordance with law by applying pursuant to any subsequent advertisement issued by the respondent-authority.*

28. In view of the foregoing discussion, the writ petition(s) are dismissed insofar as the prayers made therein are concerned. However, liberty is granted to the petitioners to apply afresh, as and when any advertisement is issued in future under the oustee category, in accordance with law.”

3. As the matter is squarely covered, instant petition is dismissed in terms of the judgment passed in **Ombir's case (supra)** with the above observations.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

11.03.2026
sheetal

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No